

21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

21st CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



Applicant Name:	Elkhart Community Schools
Proposal Ranking:	53
Average Score	90.6 / 125

Proposal Strengths:

- The application has a Community Advisement Council which is a great highlight to helping relationships and build strong connections. Using the PRIDE rubric was a standout and easy to help track development. The STEAM programming and partners prove to have a fun, strong program that will benefit the youth and be fun. The standards were well reflected in the provided table.
- -Elkhart Community Schools provided an impressive number of partners to support their proposed STEAM project. -It was exciting to hear about the established STEAM programming, Making Waves in partnership with Notre Dame, South Bend Woodworks, and Third Coast Percussion to combine music, math and science. -The applicant proposed some interesting programming and provided a wide breadth of activities that would be available to enrolled students. -Significant focus, emphasis and money will be put into Professional Development for staff and program partners will contribute to these efforts. -Having the proposed program at three different school sites is strong in eliminating transportation to and only from for students. A wider reach and larger enrollment is likely expected for these reasons. -It was a strong element to include that students are regularly being surveyed after programming to get their feedback on activities. -They included a strong emphasis of how the advisement council will be involved to enhance and improve programming. -The PRIDE rubric was a nice addition to see how they evaluate improvements in student behavior from programming efforts. -The program will provide staff competitive pay rates and salaries. -The Raptor Visit Management Software is a great asset for added safety measures for individuals who are in contact with students through the program.
- The applicant has submitted a well developed application that adequately describes the program activities and addresses each of the required components.

Proposal Weaknesses:

- The weekly activity breakdown could use more specifics in activities within one general block of time. The STEAM portion of the Objectives Table was the smallest and most surprising. Would like to see this area big much bigger to measure the youth successes.
- -For the most part, this application struggled with clarity, flow, cohesion and relevance of data to support the needs for STEAM programming in the Elkhart community. -Each section, because the applicant utilized double space line formatting, lacked the necessary detail and depth to fully explain a detailed program design and implementation. -It seemed that ECS has a great idea for programming and the right partners, but not much beyond those elements seemed concrete while formulating the

21st Century Community Learning Centers Program

21st CCLC Reviewer Scoring Report – Cohort 10



application. -There were great intentions here, but many of the sections provided relevant information that would have been more appropriate in others. Therefore, leaving too many sections with unanswered questions. -The weekly schedule was weak and lacked clarity in how STEAM programming will make an impact in an hour and twenty minutes per day, with STEAM curricula not the focus every day or most days. - Also, there were too many discrepancies between what was mentioned in the narrative and what was reflected in the budget, especially related to staffing. The budget seemed to reflect an immense level of staff/time however that did not seem to be conveyed in the narrative. -The role of the program manager was vague, as well as the site coordinators; there was no detail as to their daily roles and responsibilities in relation to the program. As much as the district is applying for the funding, it seemed too much ingrained into ECS standard programs. The applicant did not include enough detailed evidence to how this program will differ from current OST programs (examples provided were no fee, no travel to site, and more in-depth academic focus, switch from childcare to academic focus). Only surface level objectives were provided. -The applicant did not successfully portray an application from idea to fully planned program ready for implementation. There were several future tense words used such as 'will,' 'can' and 'might' which does not provide the reader with confidence. -The application lacked significant importance for volunteers and family engagement. For STEAM programming, the efforts and support must continue outside of the program site walls. -Several spelling errors and sentence structure issues throughout. Therefore, the overall application submission seemed to lack a complete edit. -The application also contained evidence of multiple voices evident here which provided contradicting statements in the narrative.

- The needs assessment did not provide specific school data to establish a clear vision of each individual school to be served. Project design section did not include specific strategies to recruit target students to attend the program.

Top Areas Where Points Were Lost:

- Program Implementation
- Professional Development
- Budget
- Evaluation
- Program Design